



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

277247

A. E. A



The Russian Church

*Published for the Anglican
and Eastern Association,
which alone is responsible
for the contents.*

The Russian Church

Lectures on its History
Constitution · Doctrine
and Ceremonial

Preface by
The Lord Bishop of London

Published for the
Anglican and Eastern Association
By the
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C.
1915

Preface

THE great War has drawn together in bonds which, please God, will never be broken the great nations of Russia and Great Britain, and it becomes, therefore, of more importance than ever that the two Churches, which are the 'souls' of the respective nations, should understand one another better and, if possible, draw closer to one another.

These four lectures are an attempt among many others to interpret sympathetically the doctrine and practice of the Eastern Church to members of the Church of England, and I well remember that, after a three hours' talk with the Prior and monks of the famous Troitsa Monastery near Moscow, the Bishop and Prior and the Priests present gave me a valuable Icon which I have placed in the Chapel of London House, and said with brotherly affection : ' We have always loved the Church of England, and now that we have seen and talked with one of her prelates, we love her all the more.'

This will show how hopeful the work of the Anglican and Eastern Association is.

The Eastern Church is a steady influence to those who imagine that to be Catholic they must imitate ' the last thing from Rome.'

For instance, the Blessed Sacrament is reserved in the Russian Church for the sick and dying, but in a quiet and unobtrusive manner almost always on the altar, and in a small metal casket, which stands behind the book of the Gospels, which latter always occupies the centre of the altar when it is not being used. The casket which is usually called 'the ark' (*kivót*) is generally divided by a partition into two parts, one of which is used for the particles, intinged with the species of wine, of the Blessed Sacrament reserved for the Communion of the sick, and also, the 'Lambs' or Consecrated Hosts, also intinged, which are reserved from the Sunday Liturgy for the communion of the priest and laity at the Liturgy of the Pre-sanctified Gifts on certain week-days in Lent, and the first three days of Holy Week, when the natural consecration of the Eucharist is forbidden by the Canons of their Church. I have often myself seen the Sacrament reserved for the sick as here described, and it is used for the sole purpose of communicating those who are unable to come to the open Communion.

The belief in the Communion with those departed is intensely real, but the practice of it quiet and natural. A boy talks to his mother, as ~~M~~ Birkbeck points out, as if she were in the room, but the grey-haired Archimandrite who presented me with the Icon, said with tears in his eyes, 'Take this as the Image of the one Master of us all.'

Mr. Birkbeck's words on p. 52 are very much to the point. 'The Russian theologians consider the differences which they find between the Latin teaching and their own on the subject of the invocation of Saints and of prayers for the dead to constitute, not a mere development of statement, but an actual alteration due to an altered conception as to the essential nature of the unity of the Church.'

The Eastern Church is also a restraining influence upon those who want to tamper in any way with the Faith. The Russian clings with touching tenacity to all the great truths of the Catholic Faith, but most of the conversation of the great ecclesiastics whom I interviewed was to the effect that they were neither idolaters nor Roman Catholics.

It is, then, very important for us to study more and more the teaching and practice of this very ancient branch of the Catholic Church, and it is in the hope that these lectures will only be the forerunner of many others on the same subject that I write this brief preface for their publication in a printed form.

A. F. LONDON.

All Saints' Day, 1915.

Contents

	PAGE
PREFACE—THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON . . .	v
THE RUSSIAN CHURCH	
ITS HISTORY—REV. PERCY DEARMER, D.D. . . .	i
ITS CONSTITUTION—REV. R. W. BURNIE . . .	12
ITS DOCTRINE—W. J. BIRKBECK, M.A. . . .	30
ITS CEREMONIAL—REV. H. J. FYNES-CLINTON, M.A. .	65

The Russian Church

I

Its History

AT the time when the English Kingdom under Æthelred the Unready was breaking down before the pagan Danes, and when Christianity in our island was already a tradition whose origin was lost in the mist of antiquity, Vladimir, the chief prince of the pagan Slavonic tribes then inhabiting south Russia, was baptised by the Byzantine Bishop of Cherson. This was not the first missionary effort of the 980.

Patriarchate of Constantinople : more than a hundred years before, St. Cyril and St. Methodius had converted the Bulgarians and other Slav people farther west, had made the Cyrillic c. 850. alphabet, which is still used in Russia, and had translated the Gospels and service-books into the Slavonic tongue. There were Christians in Russia already about this time, and a church of the Prophet Elias at Kiev ; among the converts was the widowed princess Olga, to whose example her grandson Vladimir seems to have owed his dissatisfaction with paganism.

The story of his conversion is well known. He

received emissaries from various religions :— Mussulmans from Bulgaria, Jews from among the Khazars, Western Christians from Germany (for the Eastern Church was by now practically separate from the Western, though the formal schism had not yet been brought about), and lastly a monk from Greece. Vladimir countered the arguments of the earlier visitors with barbarian simplicity, but remained in longer conference with the Greek, and was deeply moved by a picture of the Last Judgment : ‘ Blessed are these on the right hand,’ he said, ‘ but woe to those on the left ! ’ But he still hesitated ; he consulted his chief men, and next year sent delegates forth to study these religions in their various homes. The Russian envoys finally arrived at Constantinople. ‘ Let them see,’ said the Emperor Basil II, ‘ the glory of our God.’ They were taken to the Church of St. Sofia—still the finest building in the world, and soon, please God, to be a Christian Church once more : the Liturgy was sung by the Patriarch, surrounded by his deacons in their gorgeous vestments under that glorious dome : the solemn figures of the rich mosaics looked down upon them amid the flickering lights and the wreaths of incense, the yearning strains of the ancient chants rose and fell. The envoys were transfixed. Christian beauty of worship had won its greatest triumph. ‘ There is nothing else like it on earth,’ they said. ‘ There

in truth God dwells with men ; and we can never forget the beauty which there we saw. No man who has once tasted what is sweet will afterwards take what is bitter ; and as for us, we can no longer abide in heathenism.' They were true Russians in trusting to their intuition. And they were right.

Vladimir (after he had, in his pagan way, made war upon the Greek emperor, and won Basil's sister and his religion alike with the sword) was baptised at Cherson. His next act, after he had built a church to St. Basil, was to return to Kiev, to hurl the great idol of the thunder-god into the Dniéper, and to declare that he would hold for his enemy any who did not come to be christened. His people obeyed willingly enough, and were baptised in the river by the Greek clergy who named them in droves, while Vladimir stood in a transport of joy on the bank. It is all very characteristic of Russian history, and significant both in the points where it resembles, and in those where it differs from, the conversion of our own Æthelbert by St. Augustine.

Gradually thereafter, as in England, order began to grow up out of chaos. The infant nation of Russia consisted of independent principalities, held slightly together by the senior member of the ruling family, the Grand Prince, who lived at Kiev. They gradually became one, as the princes and Greek

bishops converted them into one Church,—not a Russian Church yet, but a province of the Greek Church, with a Metropolitan, who was for more than two hundred years nearly always a Greek, living at Kiev. It was Constantinople that civilised Russia, and the religious basis of Russia is Byzantine to this day, as her deepest tradition is the championship of Christendom against the Turks, who in a later age overthrew Byzantium itself.

Huge must have been the task of the monks, who in their absolute self-abnegation and the untiring courage of their zeal carried the civilisation of their Greek teachers among the wild tribes.

During our Norman period there were
 1054–
 1224. eighty-three civil wars and 293 different claimants to the principedom. Other centres began to supersede Kiev, notably Novgorod and Moscow. But Russia was becoming a nation, a nation in a church.

Then came the terror of the Tatar invasion
 1224. (just two years before St. Francis died at Assisi). By 1240 the Tatar domination had begun, and it continued for 240 years (from our Henry III to Richard III, from Simon de Montfort to Caxton). The adversity
 1240–
 1480. welded the Russian people together, and based their nationality more deeply in their Church: indeed, like the Balkan nations under a far more cruel Moslem oppression, when they ceased to

exist as an independent nation they continued to exist as a Church. Indeed, their Church won its independence during these miserable hard years. Kiev was laid waste in 1243, and the Metropolitan perished with it : his successor was a Russian, and the Patriarch of Constantinople agreed to the appointment. The centre of gravity was shifting to middle Russia. Kiev was again laid waste. The Metropolitans moved to Vladimir in 1299. In 1325 they settled in Moscow.

Kiev, Moscow, Petrograd. These three towns give one the three periods of Russian history. Muscovy was rich and comparatively secure ; the Grand Prince of Moscow obtained the absolute supremacy of Russia, he dealt wisely with the Tatars, and he was the ' eldest son ' and the protector of the Metropolitan.

In 1380 (just before the death of Wyclif) the heroic Dimítry of the Don defeated the Tatars ; and though the victory was a barren one, it proved that Moscow was the champion of the Church and the nation against the ' Golden Horde,' and its prince the head of a nation, and not the mere chief of a coalition of princelets. In 1462 (when the Wars of the Roses were nearly over in England)

1462. Ivan the Great founded the Tsardom of Muscovy. By 1480 the Tatar domination was completely at an end. The Russian Church is now firmly established as a National Church ; and,

identical as always with the Russian people, it is ruled from the strong, holy city of Moscow, where in the Kremlin Tsar and Metropolitan dwell side by side, secure and all-powerful in the heart of the vast country. Meanwhile the parent Church had itself sunk under Moslem oppression; for in 1453 Constantinople had fallen.

When—the year after we defeated the Spanish Armada—the Metropolitan of Moscow became Patriarch, there was no change except that of pomp and circumstance. He had long been the virtual patriarch of the Russian Church; and the Church itself gained nothing more than it had already in being pronounced autocephalous by his nominal superior, the unhappy Patriarch of Constantinople, now a subject of the Turks.

So the three periods are still Kiev, Moscow, and Petrograd, and the three chief dates 980, 1320, and 1721. The establishment of the Patriarchate in the middle of the Moscow period is not the foundation of the independent Russian Church, but only a picturesque incident proclaiming the fact.

But the trials of the Russian Church and people were not over. At the time when Shakespeare was writing his greatest plays, the Poles were masters of Moscow; and Russia lay, leaderless, in powerless misery. Then it was that the indomitable Russian spirit showed

itself in all its fervent intermingling of religion and patriotism. *The famous monastery of the Tróitsa*, a day's journey from Moscow, resisted the Poles

1610. in a sixteen months' siege, and then sent out letters calling upon the Russian people to drive away the invader. There was no Tsar

1612. alive; the Patriarch Hermogenes was starved to death in his prison by the Poles;

but the Russian people held together with the heart of one great family of brothers. A national host swarmed up to Moscow, drove out the Poles,

1613. and a National Assembly elected as Tsar a boy of fifteen, Michael Románov, son of Philaret, the Metropolitan of Rostóv, and the first ruler of the present imperial house. Philaret was released from a Polish prison, brought to Moscow, and made Patriarch; and there Russia was made great again by father and son, Patriarch and Tsar, together, in a sublime example of that union of spiritual and temporal power which is characteristically Russian.

Nikon, a peasant's son, was Patriarch during the years when Oliver Cromwell ruled in England.

He was able, uncompromising, masterful,
1652-8. and modern. In the face of furious opposition he corrected some translator's mistakes in the Russian service-books, ordered that the sign of the Cross should be made with three fingers instead of two, and that the name of Jesus should

be spelt with two I's instead of one. When London was being rebuilt after the Fire, a great Synod deposed Nikon, but at the same time excommunicated those who would not accept his corrections. Thus arose Russian Dissent: the 1667. *Staroobryádtzy* ('old ritualists') or *Starovyéry* ('old believers') were henceforth the *Raskólniky* ('the separated'). It is all characteristic of the immense difference between East and West: the Church had been too progressive for the people, and Dissent arose in the interests of conservatism—of those who were too orthodox for the Orthodox Church; and, as happens sometimes with extreme conservatism even in the West, it was all a fuss about nothing. But fierce struggles and persecutions followed; the wildest sects sprang up from the *Bezpopóvtsy*, the priestless section of the Raskol, fierce ascetics, errants, self-mutilators, sects of licence, silent sects, and sects of suicide (as late as 1897 twenty-four persons had themselves buried alive)—every example of the madness of collective hysteria and the *idée fixe*. At the same time there are mystical sects like the *Dukhabórtzy*, inspired by a kind of saintly foolishness, and sects of Western type like the Stundists and Russian Baptists; while the steady-going Old Believers include many of the most business-like, prosperous, and exemplary families of modern Russia. It is difficult to estimate the strength of Dissent in the

Empire, but the true figure seems to lie somewhere between ten and twenty millions, as against the hundred million members of the Russian Orthodox Church. Far more dangerous for the future has been the falling away of the *Intelligentsia* from the Church.

In 1700 the last Patriarch of Moscow died—two years before our Queen Anne was dead. Peter the Great—for good and evil the maker of modern Russia—moved the seat of government from Moscow to the town that he built and called by the German name of Petersburg. He wished to ‘open a window upon the west.’ He also tried to Germanise the Russian Church, forbade the election of a new Patriarch, and in 1721 established the Holy Governing Synod on the model of the Lutheran consistories. So begins the modern period of Russian Church history—Kiev, Moscow, and now Petrograd.

The Holy Synod consists of the Metropolitans of these three cities, Kiev, Moscow, and Petrograd, the Exarch of Georgia, whose Church was a century ago incorporated with the Russian, and
1802. five or six other Bishops nominated by the Tsar, all sitting under the presidency of the Oberprokuror, a layman also nominated by the Emperor. It was an excellent plan for a man like Peter the Great, who wished to have the Church entirely under his thumb. From other points of

view there is nothing to be said for this anomalous system of Church government, except that it makes the opposite evil of papalism impossible. A Synod, the majority of whose members can be summarily dismissed and replaced by the Emperor, reduces the Church to something like the level of a department of the State: it makes initiative dangerous for the clergy and progress difficult, holding the Church back—just at the time when students, thinkers, prophets, are urgently needed in her ranks, if the dangers of modern life are to be averted, its manifold opportunities grasped, and the glorious tradition of Russian religion preserved for future generations.

Since the establishment of the Holy Synod the deep evangelical traditions of Russian Christianity have continued to flourish, because the religion of the people is too intimate and vital to be disturbed by a change of organisation. Russia has brought the Gospel to vast tracts of Asia in her great missionary efforts; and Russia has continued to produce thousands of Christlike men and women: but the Church, as a Church, has not moved, and the danger is that educated Russia—which one day will be all Russia—may leave the Church behind.

Our history of the Russian Church stops indeed with the establishment of the Holy Synod, because since then she has had no history. She has just gone on existing in all her deep and wonderful

strength, under the shadow of the State, and voicing no other conscience. And such a condition must lead to ultimate exhaustion, unless, as many of her most devoted children hope, she recovers that right of self-government which belongs inalienably to every Church. Russia is at this moment throwing over many foreign importations ; and a revival of the Moscow Patriarchate may come quite suddenly—or perhaps the annexation of Constantinople may bring about a still greater change. It would be a revival under new conditions, such as were not possible in the old days, when she was working out that terrible struggle for existence, from which she emerged to be great among the nations. We cannot prophecy. But Russia is a young giant that is looking into the future ; and Russia will surely make a new chapter in Christian history.

The Russian Church

II

Its Constitution

THE subject which has been assigned to me has one objection to be made to it. It may be said that the constitution of the Russian Church must simply be the constitution of the Catholic Church. The Russian Church cannot be a separate entity and yet a part of the entity of the Catholic Church. If the Russian Church has a special constitution, then so much the worse for the Russian Church. The objection is misconceived. That there may be smaller corporate entities within larger corporate entities is in fact demonstrated by everyone's experience, and would never be disputed by anyone, were not some minds dominated by misunderstood theories of later Roman lawyers who themselves did not open their eyes to the separate, if subordinate, political entities which existed within the one Roman Empire. Every Englishman to-day belongs to several such separate entities, whether in contemplation of law they be corporations or not. I myself, for example, belong to the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple, to the diocese

of London, to the province of Canterbury, to the Church of England. None of these real persons (for they are all, in greater or less degree, real persons) are recognised as corporations, 'bodies corporate,' by English law. But they exist as entities, and not mere names for the collection of individuals of which they are composed. Doubtless the Honourable Society of the Middle Temple is subordinate to the British Empire and to many intermediate entities. But it is a real separate organism, with a collective will and character transcending those of its individual constituents. So with the diocese of London and the province of Canterbury and the Church of England in the Catholic Church. These are propositions which have been well recognised by modern comparative lawyers such as our own Maitland and the German Gierke, propositions which Dr. Figgis has lately rightly urged upon our notice.

So that separate subordinate entity, the Church of Russia, has quite rightly a subordinate constitution of her own, different from that of the Church of Constantinople, of Rome, or of England ; although all these Churches are members of the indefinitely greater entity (and subject to the Divine constitution) of the *One Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church*.

It is of that special subordinate constitution of the Church of Russia that I speak to-day. In the first lecture of this course the history of the

Russian Church was recounted to you, and I do not propose, of course, to go over again the ground so ably covered. But I must now and again look back at past constitutions of the Church of Russia to explain its present one.

The first cardinal fact to be noted is that Russia—all Russia—is and always has been one ecclesiastical province. We are accustomed to regard the province of Canterbury as over-grown, and the Western mind finds it hard to grasp the conception that all Russia and even places far outside the Russian Empire are one province under one Metropolitan, now represented by the Holy Governing Synod. I say that this is the first cardinal fact to be noted in considering the Russian ecclesiastical constitution, because from it flow (more or less directly) most other peculiarities. Rather, perhaps, we might put it that in Russia the proper provincial system has never existed—except in a rudimentary form which has not survived. Georgia is possibly an exception. Its annexation to the Empire is comparatively modern. It is governed ecclesiastically by its 'Exarch,' with three suffragans under him. These suffragans have the titles of Archbishop of Gori, Archbishop of Imeretia, and Metropolitan of Mingrelia. These titles, however, are merely titles. The Exarch is as dependent on the Holy Governing Synod at Petrograd as any ordinary diocesan bishop. He

indeed does hold a subordinate provincial Synod of his own and is himself a member of the Governing Synod. It may perhaps therefore be contended that Georgia is a true province of which Petrograd is the patriarchate. It has, however, no real independence of the Governing Synod. A true province has only a strictly limited subjection to its patriarchate. On the other hand, certainly the 'province' of Russia extends far beyond the limits of the vast Empire—to Japan, Alaska, and San Francisco.

As in Georgia so in the Russian 'province' at large, there are numerous purely titular 'archbishops' and 'metropolitans,' but they have merely diocesan jurisdiction. Metropolitan is the higher *title*, and a bishop metropolitan takes precedence of an archbishop. In like manner, dioceses in Russia are called *eparchies*, which in Greek, from *ἐπαρχία*, is the proper name for 'provinces.'

A primitive precedent (on a much smaller scale) can be found for the Russian system in the case of Egypt. There the Bishop or Pope, afterwards styled the Patriarch, of Alexandria was the only true Metropolitan, although there were other titular metropolitans without metropolitanical jurisdiction.

The true Metropolitan of Russia, after the Conversion in 988, was long settled at Kiev. The province at this time belonged to the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Œcumenical Patriarch

appointed and consecrated the Russian Metropolitan, and appeals lay to Constantinople.

In 1610 the Patriarch was asked by a leading Russian prince to divide the Russian province. The Russian monarchy had not yet been finally formed. The Patriarch took a most momentous decision (with effects reaching to our day) by refusing the princely request. He declined, he said, to 'break the unity of the Russian Church.' The Russian Church as truly preceded the Russian Empire as the English Church preceded the English monarchy. In both cases the unity of the Church largely caused the unity of the State.

Because of the devastations of the Mongols and the 'Golden Horde,' the Metropolitan removed for a short time to Vladimir: still with the title of 'Metropolitan of Kiev and of all Russia.'

In 1305 the Metropolitan finally settled at Moscow; but he was styled Metropolitan of Kiev until that city was separated for a time from the Russian Empire. The capture of Constantinople by the Crusaders and the temporary establishment of a Latin Empire in the East much weakened the hold of the Œcumenical Patriarchate (domiciled at Nicæa) over the Russian Church. After the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, the Russian province, with its Metropolitan at Moscow, became *de facto* 'autocephalous.' The Metropolitan was now chosen and consecrated in Russia. Appeals

to Constantinople ceased in practice ; although the right of appeal might still subsist in theory. For good or for evil, the Russian Church, after five centuries of existence, became independent at much the same period as that of England ; although, of course, under very different conditions and in very different circumstances.

One of the evil results in the Russian case, perhaps, was that the Tsar took the place, at least in Russia, of the now perished Byzantine Augusti. A sacred character was ascribed to these last which sometimes interfered with the independence of the hierarchy. They were said to be 'anointed lords, like the bishops.' So Balsamon (the great Eastern canonist representing the Oriental view of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries) declares them to be. Moreover, he mentions the opinion of some who held the Augusti as subject neither to civil law (*this* opinion has been maintained again and again even in the West) nor to canon law. Hence arose the practice of deposing Bishops by imperial decree. Synods were expected to afterwards confirm, perhaps rather to accept, such decrees. I carefully speak of the practice rather than of theory. Since the fifteenth century a similar practical power has been exercised by the Ottoman rulers at Constantinople, although they certainly are not 'anointed lords.' It has not been found possible to dispute this usurpation. The

germ of this interference by Cæsar with the household of God may be found in the practices of the Arian Emperors in the fourth century. The anointing of the Tsars in Byzantine fashion began perhaps with the Tsar Theodore (in 1582). In any case, after that date, this anointing and the communicating of the Autocrat within the sanctuary became an invariable custom. The Tsar Theodore (perhaps because he was an 'anointed, lord') deposed Dionysius Grammaticus (the Metropolitan) after the fashion of the Byzantine Cæsars.

A momentous change was now made in the Russian ecclesiastical constitution. The Metropolitan of Russia became a Patriarch. It must always be remembered that this change still subsists in its results. The new-fangled 'Holy Governing Synod' has succeeded to all the patriarchal rights of the Patriarch of Moscow, although the Patriarchate itself is abolished. The state of things since the fall of Constantinople had been anomalous. As has been said, the Russian Church had been *de facto* autocephalous, but *de jure* it was still a province of the Patriarchate of Constantinople.

Muravyev puts the matter strongly :—

'About 150 years had elapsed since the fall of Constantinople ; and the Metropolitans of all Russia who were appointed during all that time by Synods of their own Bishops had not been confirmed by the Patriarchs ; although they still

reckoned themselves as forming part of their spiritual jurisdiction. Acquiescence in this, in the first instance, and the calamitous circumstances of the East, might partly excuse this irregularity in that subordination of the hierarchy which is so necessary to the unity of the Catholic Church; but the longer continuance of such a state of things might have been attended with danger. . . . However, it was impossible for the Russian Church to become independent without the common consent of the four œcumenical patriarchs;¹ lest she should fall into a fatal violation of unity.'

This passage from the ecclesiastical historian is important as showing the clinging in essentials of the Russian Church to the Church Catholic; despite deviations from Catholic discipline which we shall presently notice. For those deviations Peter the Great, with his Westernising and Erastianising disposition, is mainly responsible. Events now in progress may largely rectify them.

It is right to say that the opinion of Muravyev as to the dependence upon Constantinople of the original Russian Church is not accepted by all Russian churchmen. Karamzin and Platon take an opposite view. The latter says that the Russian Church had a right to elect and consecrate her own

¹ The phrase 'œcumenical patriarch' is often extended to all the patriarchs.

primates, and that the will of the Tsar was quite sufficient reason for setting aside a custom which had grown up naturally enough, but which was yet, strictly speaking, uncanonical.

It is true that at a very early period Hilarion, in 1051, had been chosen Metropolitan and consecrated without reference to Constantinople; but that irregularity had been mended by a letter of blessing, which Hilarion sought and obtained from the Michael Cerularius whose name is unhappily associated with the Great Schism.

Later, in 1127, there is another isolated instance (before 1452) of the election of a Metropolitan by the Russian Synod without approval by Constantinople. This was in the case of Clement. He was consecrated also locally. Possible defects supposed in his consecration were supplied by laying on his head the left hand of St. Clement of Rome, the Apostolic father, whose relics had been brought from Cherson to Kiev by Vladimir. The whole story, of course, of the martyrdom of St. Clement in the Chersonese is a fiction. The acts are spurious, and part of a series of legends and romances which have gathered round the Apostolic father. Still, some relics, supposed to be St. Clement's, were translated to Rome from the Chersonese by St. Cyril and St. Methodius, apostles of the Slavs. Yet another set of Clementine relics was brought by Prince Yaroslav himself from

Cherson to Kiev. So he told the ambassador of Henry I of France. 'We must not digress from our subject to make a deeply interesting inquiry into these various findings of spurious relics of a great saint who possibly was never martyred at all. The use of the alleged hand of St. Clement did not hinder protest against his namesake's occupancy of the Russian primacy. St. Niphont of Novgorod refused his communion to one who had not been appointed from Constantinople. Strife lasted for many years. In the end the rights of New Rome triumphed.

However, now in 1589, the Metropolitan of Moscow was created Patriarch, with equality to the other four Patriarchs. He was actually consecrated afresh to the Patriarchate by the Patriarch of Constantinople, who was then in Russia, as though the Patriarchate were a separate holy order and not merely a degree of the episcopate. This is not an isolated example in the East of a remarkable practice, which testifies to an unformulated ecclesiastical view which undoubtedly was then prevalent. The new Patriarchs created some titular 'Metropolitans'; but Russia continued one province, and the Patriarch was the only true Metropolitan with jurisdiction. The other Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem afterwards synodically recognised their new brother of Moscow. Some synodical letters acknowledged the Patriarch of Moscow as fifth patriarch in place

of the Bishop of Rome, who had fallen away. He was assigned place after Jerusalem; but the Russian Church gave him precedence immediately after Constantinople. He was styled 'Œcumenical Lord'—Constantinople being strictly 'Œcumenical Patriarch,' and Alexandria 'Œcumenical Judge.'

This address is on the 'constitution,' not on the history of the Russian Church, which has been already dealt with; but it has been needful to notice these changes, as it will be needful to notice the great change to come, because the present Constitution cannot be understood without reference to the past.

The delicate and vital question of the relation of Patriarch to Autocrat was never solved definitely. The relation of Church to State has never been definitely solved in the East, or perhaps anywhere. Excellent maxims have been formulated, capable of much elasticity. More than that we cannot say. Certainly there has never been any departure in theory from Catholic doctrine. In practice one can hardly speak so confidently.

I have insisted again and again on the fact that Russia was always (as it is) one province; but I may mention in passing that for a time (because of political changes) a real Metropolitan existed at Kiev (the original primatial See) with jurisdiction over Little Russia and Poland. This has not really altered the principle in the long run.

In 1653, the six years' reign of the Patriarch Nikon did produce a conflict between Tsar and Patriarch, which has left lasting results and undoubtedly influenced Peter the Great in his momentous changes. As usually, church property began the discussion. The Tsar John had forbidden any increase of the Church's immoveable property; but the decree had been systematically disregarded. The very devout Tsar Alexis, in the middle of the seventeenth century, was induced to institute the 'Monastery Court,' as it was called. This was a purely lay tribunal which judged all civil suits against clerics and matters in reference to ecclesiastical real property. Beforetime, these actions had been decided in the Court of the Patriarch. This decree was blessed by the Patriarch Joseph, and the clergy subscribed. Representatives of the laity demanded the enforcement by this tribunal of the decree of the Tsar John. As to this, Alexis (himself a constant benefactor of the Church, contrary to John's decree) ordered an inquiry and a return of land acquired after the Johannine ukase. Matters slumbered for a time, Nikon resumed to his own Court the decision of all civil suits against the clergy. The Council of the Nobles presently restored its jurisdiction to the Monastery Court and enforced John's edict. The weak Tsar Alexis, in effect, sided with the nobles. The matter was complicated in many ways, notably by Nikon's

'reforms of the service-books. Nikon was deposed by a great Synod of Bishops, and in the end by a patriarchal Synod held at Moscow, in which the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch presided. This was in 1667.

The last of the Patriarchs, Adrian, opposed as long as he lived the 'reforms' of Peter the Great. He died A.D. 1700. Peter appointed, pending his great changes, Stephen 'Metropolitan' of Riazan 'Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne.' It was manifest that the Patriarchate was too much a counterpoise to the Autocracy to be tolerated by the maker of the new Russia which was to last two centuries. The memory of Nikon was doubtless as hateful to him as that of St. Thomas of Canterbury to Henry VIII. The Tsar Theodore during the reign of the patriarch Joachim had once more abolished the Monastery Court. Theodore had shown much devotion to Nikon, who lived some years after his deposition, and after Nikon's death had obtained for him, from the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, letters of absolution and 'restoration to their pontifical assembly.' Peter the Great restored the Monastery Court, but limited its jurisdiction to the real property of the Church. It must be remembered that that real property included (till the Emancipation) millions of serfs. This property was now to be managed by lay officials and fixed stipends paid to the clergy.

The number of Religious (and therefore of the 'Black' clergy alone eligible by Eastern practice for the episcopate) was limited. On the other hand, the Patriarchal Court, after some hesitation, was given jurisdiction over all suits against the clergy not relating to real property. The ordinary ecclesiastical court for the enforcement of clerical discipline was re-opened. Serious heretics, lay or clerical, were judged in Synod, and lay men on conviction handed over to the civil authority.

This transition regime lasted for twenty years. At last, in 1721, Peter succeeded in establishing the so-called 'Most Holy Governing Synod'—which still flourishes. It has taken over all the metropolitan and patriarchal authority once enjoyed by the Bishops of Moscow. It has indeed much more authority than rightly belongs to Metropolitan or Patriarch. It is, so to speak, an autocracy corporate.

The new organisation was put forth as a restoration of primitive conciliar government. In fact, it is a Synod only in name, and differs fundamentally from Synods before the schism, and even from more modern patriarchal and papal Synods.

The constitution of the 'Holy Governing Synod' was put forth by the Tsar; but this constitution (or 'Regulation' as it was called) was signed by a small 'council' of Petrograd, consisting of the 'Guardian of the Patriarchal Throne,' six of

his suffragans (two of them titular Metropolitans), six archpriests, and seven high civil dignitaries. It is more accurate to say that these personages witnessed the 'Regulation,' which was simply read to them. The Tsar had first signed and confirmed it. It is fair to say that afterwards it was subscribed by all the bishops and archpriests and abbots of the first rank in the Russian Church. After some negotiation, the four Patriarchs accepted the new body corporate as 'our Brother in Christ, the Holy and Sacred Synod.'

The Governing Synod consists of members of the clergy appointed by the Tsar—a small number of bishops and priests. It is assisted by a procurator, who is a layman, also appointed by the Autocrat. The procurator 'explains to the Synod the limits of its jurisdiction,' and is the medium between it and the Emperor or any secular authorities. The Synod appoints delegated commissions, with a portion of its jurisdiction, to sit at Moscow and in Georgia. The Georgian sub-commission is presided over by the 'exarch' or primate. The Metropolitan of Moscow may be a member of the Governing Synod, but his metropolitanical designation is now like that of other Russian Metropolitans, a mere matter of nomenclature, importing no jurisdiction.

There now remain to ecclesiastical courts in Russia purely ecclesiastical discipline of clerks and

lay-folk and matrimonial causes. The court of first instance is the consistory court of the Bishop. This consists of a small body of ecclesiastics. Its decisions must be confirmed by the Bishop. In the more important causes—such as divorce *a vinculo*—it only gives a provisional decision, which is reported by the Bishop, together with his own opinion, for final judgment to the most Holy Governing Synod.

That Synod alone can decree divorce *a vinculo* absolutely. It only can try Bishops. It alone deals with the secular crimes of spiritual persons if they are of importance and yet not capital. The capital crimes, even of clergy, are reserved for the secular forum. The Governing Synod has exclusive jurisdiction of heresy and schism. It nominates three persons for vacant bishoprics. From this list the Tsar selects one for appointment—usually, it is said, after asking the advice of the Synod. The Synod has all the authority of a patriarch or great council. The Tsar formally confirms its judgments, but sometimes reduces penalties in the exercise of the prerogative of mercy.

It is some evidence of merits in the Russian ecclesiastical constitution that it has been copied in Greece. Since the War of Independence and the separation of the Hellenic kingdom from the Patriarchate of Constantinople, that kingdom has been organised in Russian fashion, as an auto-

cephalous province with merely an honorary Metropolitan and honorary archbishops governed by a 'Holy Synod.' The Metropolitan of Athens is, however, in this case, president *ex officio*. The other members are four bishops appointed in annual rotation by the Government from those senior on the episcopal bench. No priests are members. A government commissioner is attached, with no vote, but affixing his signature to the synodical judgments. It will be observed that some objectionable features in the Russian Church constitution have been modified.

The Balkan Churches, on achieving independence of Constantinople, have not followed the Russian system, but are constituted on a more primitive basis.

I have dealt only with what is special in the constitution of the Russian Church, showing its historical derivation. I have left untouched, therefore, the rules in regard to clerical marriage and the distinction between white clergy and black which it has in common with the other Orthodox Churches.

Moreover, I have endeavoured only to state facts, so far as I know them. Conclusions are for you. But I do desire to say that whatever deviations Russia has made from the norm of Catholic discipline, we must always remember that on divided Christendom there have been deviations everywhere. Certainly the Papacy is a most

serious deviation. The task of pointing out our own Anglican turnings aside would be too easy. The ideal Church nowhere exists in fact—perhaps never has existed, never will exist while militant on earth. And yet God guides the whole Church infallibly with all her local errors, not only in discipline.

* We may perhaps lift up our eyes unto the hills in these times of a great War with a certitude that help is coming. If indeed, as seems to us likely, the end of the War find New Rome annexed to Russia, much that seems anomalous must disappear. Russia can no longer remain an autocephalous province. The second See in Christendom will recover its importance and will probably be more independent of the secular power than ever, since its patriarchal jurisdiction will probably be no longer confined within a single secular sovereignty. No wonder that they of Rome do not like the prospect. Hence much veiled sympathy at the Vatican with Austria, with Germany, and even with the Turk.

The Russian Church

III

Its Doctrine

MY subject is the 'Doctrine of the Russian Church.' By this, it is not meant that there is any doctrinal difference to be found between the Russian Church and the Church of the Eastern Patriarchates, or the other autocephalous Churches of the Orthodox East. I am merely proposing to put before you certain points of view upon doctrinal questions which I have come across in Russian theological literature, and in personal intercourse with Russian churchmen, which I think are worthy of our consideration. They are inevitably of a somewhat polemical complexion, but I think that the great merit of the Russian controversial writers of the last hundred years, as contrasted with much that was written by Russians and Greeks in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, whether against Rome or Protestantism, is that these polemics consist not merely of negations, but that they are eminently constructive, and enable one to arrive at the true doctrinal position of the Eastern Church.

The first time that I came into connection with Russian ecclesiastical affairs was at the celebration at Kiev in the year 1882 of the Ninth Centenary of the 'Baptising of the Russian nation': that is to say of the Conversion of Russia to Christianity under the Grand Duke St. Vladimir. Many letters of congratulation were addressed to the Metropolitan Plato of Kiev on that occasion, including one from our Archbishop Benson, which was highly appreciated. But amongst the most remarkable of these letters was one from the flourishing Russian Orthodox Mission in Japan which at that time already numbered 25,000 converts, with a clergy consisting, with two exceptions, entirely of native Japanese under the Russian Bishop Nicholas. In this letter the general points at issue between Orthodoxy on the one hand and Rome and Protestantism on the other are set forth, in somewhat unconventional terms it is true, but at the same time so vigorously and clearly, that I think I cannot do better than begin my paper with some extracts from it. It was written in the Japanese language, but was read on that occasion in a Russian translation, from which I have in turn translated it into English.

After referring to the well-known story of St. Vladimir's conversion, and to the various envoys which had been sent from the different religious bodies, Jewish, Mohammedan, and Latin as well as

and comparing the teaching of both with Orthodoxy, the letter continues :—

‘ The one set, the further they go the more do they add of “ the wood, hay, and stubble ” of human imaginations and inventions, which they have come across and picked up on their way, unto the “ gold, silver, and precious stones ” of the Divine doctrine ; the others, the further they go, the more do they fritter away of the treasure of the doctrine of God. Are not both alike preparing for those who shall trust and follow after them the bitterness of error and disenchantment, as well as a fresh search for the true Faith in time to come ? It is the Orthodox Church alone which can “ give to drink from the fount of the sweetness of the word of God ” to those who come to her, for she alone has preserved the Divine doctrine just as it was committed to her, and will preserve it unchanged to the end of the ages, without adding to or taking from it a single iota, inasmuch as she is “ the pillar and ground of the truth,” inasmuch as the Spirit of God, which dwelleth within her, preserveth her from all error.’ ”

We have here the doctrinal position of the Eastern Church set forth without any theological technicalities in the simplest and clearest manner. The Orthodox Church stands for ‘ the faith once delivered unto the saints,’ and does not admit of

the possibility of subsequent additions to or subtractions from it. At first sight it would appear that it is very much the position taken up by the Oxford Tractarians, and I remember that a well-known Oxford theologian, to whom I sent this document some twenty-five years ago, wrote to me that it was practically identical in principle with those set forth in Dr. Newman's *Via Media*. This is not quite the case. It may in some ways be true theologically, and it is doubtless true historically, to say that the Church of England is a *Via Media* between Rome and Protestantism. But this is certainly not true of the Eastern Church. She neither historically had any part in the troubles which overtook the Western Church in the sixteenth century, nor has she ever regarded herself theologically as a *Via Media* between those contending parties. On the contrary, she looks upon Romanism and Protestantism as parts of the same thing, the latter, namely Protestantism, logically following upon the former—two aspects of the same error, that error being the rejection of the authority of the Universal Church, under the influence of rationalism, and the substitution in its place of other authorities, more or less conventional.

The Russian theologians of the middle of the last century, especially those of the Slavophile school, devoted much of their labours to the study of the nature of the Church. According to their

theology, the Church is not merely an institution, differing only from other institutions, such as the State, in being a spiritual instead of a secular institution; it is something much more than this. It is a living organism of faith and love, or, as one of them puts it, 'faith and love as an organism,' the Body of which Christ is the Head, and of which all those who have been, are, or shall be brought into it are the members, fulfilling itself indeed in time, but nevertheless constituting not an imaginary or allegorical, but a true and substantial unity. It is to the whole Body, and not to the hierarchy apart from the rest of the Body, that the custody of the faith is committed: even in the case of a General Council, it is not the number or the dignity of the prelates who take part in it which establishes its œcumenical authority, it is only when the Church as a whole accepts its decisions as the expression of her own belief that they become binding upon the whole Church.

The Russian theologians of whom I am speaking caused some searchings of heart, when they declared that there was no place in the Orthodox Church for the distinction insisted upon in the Latin Communion between the *Ecclesia docens* and the *Ecclesia discens*; and fault was found with them, not only from Latin quarters, but by certain Russian theologians who had been influenced by Western

systems of theology. But just at that time there appeared the reply in the year 1848 of the Eastern Patriarchs to the Encyclical of Pius IX, which proved that theirs was the true view of the whole Eastern Church. In this document, drawn up at Constantinople by a Synod of three Patriarchs and twenty-eight Bishops, and afterwards translated and published in Russia by the Church authorities, it is plainly stated: 'We have no worldly office of inspection, or sacred direction, such as his Holiness speaks of, but are united in the unity of the faith only by the bond of love and zeal for our common mother. . . . With us neither patriarchs nor Council could introduce anything new, for the guardian of religion with us is the body itself, that is to say, the people, of the Church.'

This does not mean that the pastoral functions of the hierarchy, including the instruction of their flocks in the faith, any more than their sacramental and disciplinary powers, are derived from, below and not from above. On the contrary, just as the Bishops exist in order to instruct their diocese in the faith, so when controversies arise, they are the natural instruments to formulate the doctrine of the Church in council. The point is, that the gift of infallibility is not only not contained in, but that it is strictly separated from, hierarchial functions. Not only no individual

Bishop, however illustrious his See, but no council of Bishops, however important and numerous attended, can put forward any *a priori* claim to define the faith *ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae* ; the gift of infallibility (which is the same thing as faith) is bestowed not upon individuals, nor upon a class of individuals, but upon the totality of the ecclesiastical body, and is considered as a corollary of the moral principle of mutual love. This position, which is in direct contradiction, not only to that of Rome, but, as a Russian theologian has said, ' to the individualism and rationalism which lies at the bottom of every Protestant doctrine,' may be traced as a working system throughout the whole history of the Orthodox Eastern Church. Perhaps the most striking instance was the prompt rejection of the Council of Florence both by the Greeks and by the Russians, in spite of the fact that the highest members of the hierarchy of both their nations had taken part in that council and had subscribed to its decrees.

I think that you will now see what Russian theological writers mean when they say that from their point of view Romanism and Protestantism represent two aspects of the same error, that error being the rejection of the authority of the Universal Church and the substitution of something else in its stead. Let us see how it works out in the question of the

Filioque. This question has been a great deal discussed in Russia of late years in connection with the negotiations which were then going on between the Holy Synod and the Old Catholics, and I think that certain stumbling-blocks between East and West were undoubtedly removed. The question was whether the Old Catholics, who had already removed the word *Filioque* from the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, might yet retain the expression in their catechisms and manuals of theological instruction. Much learning was expended on the subject, by the Russian theologians, and eventually the commission of the Holy Synod appointed to deal with the Old Catholic question formulated and accepted the following three propositions: (1) 'We believe that the Father is the Cause of the Son and of the Spirit: the Son through generation, but the Holy Ghost through procession. The Father begetteth the Son and causeth the Holy Ghost to proceed: while the Son is begotten of the Father and the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father. And so we worship one Cause and acknowledge the Father as the one Cause of the Son and of the Spirit.' [This first proposition is taken word for word from the Confession of Faith made by an Orthodox Bishop before his Consecration.] (2) 'In theological speculations we avoid every sort of representation or expression, by which there might in any way be recognised two causes or two

principles in the Holy Trinity, even if such be understood not in a similar sense, as for instance if the Son were recognised as a *secondary* principle, or a *secondary* cause of the Holy Ghost, or if the Father and the Son were conceived of as united into one principle for the sending forth of the Holy Ghost.' (3) 'We offer to theological speculation and investigation the elucidation of the view met with in the writings of some of the Holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church concerning the manifestation or shining forth or procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father through the son (τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς δι' Υἱοῦ φανεροῦνται, ἡ ἐκλάμπει, ἡ πρόεισιν, ἡ ἐκπορεύεται), whether this shining forth from the Father through the Son refers only to the temporal mission of the Holy Ghost into the world for conferring grace upon created beings, or whether it may be likewise conceived of in the eternal life of the Godhead.'

Now I will not dwell further upon this pronouncement than to say that the last clause seems to admit of the retention of *Filioque* in the theological text-books of the Old Catholics as a theological opinion, provided that it be taken as not contradicting the former two clauses, but only as a form used in the West in effect equivalent to the widely used Eastern *theologoumenon* or theological opinion of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father

through (*διὰ*) the Son. That is to say, that the use of the term *Filioque* as a theological opinion need not constitute an *impedimentum dirimens* to intercommunion, provided that the term, if used in connection with the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit, be understood to imply, not a second, nor even a secondary cause of His being, but only a *condition* of His procession. But I fear that I cannot agree with those who, in writing to the English press some two years ago, seemed to think that these propositions had finally got rid of one of the chief difficulties between East and West. It must be remembered that while the Old Catholics had already removed the word *Filioque* from the Creed, the rest of the West has not done so: and that a statement in the Creed constitutes, not a *theologoumenon* or theological opinion, but a dogma of the faith. And it is obvious that the Eastern Church cannot contemplate making any concessions so far as the Creed is concerned. I have read very carefully the writings on the subject (in connection with the Old Catholic commission) by the late Professor V. Bolotoff of Petrograd, which were published at length last year. His learning and his conciliatory attitude towards the Western view of the subject are universally acknowledged, and the influential part he took in the discussions of the commission is well known. Yet from beginning to end of what he wrote there is not the least

hint of his contemplating the toleration of *Filioque* in the Creed; nor even in the theological text-books as anything more than a theological opinion which under safeguards is capable of Orthodox interpretation. And, after all, a theological opinion, whatever even patristic weight it may have behind it, amounts to nothing more than a conjecture. But how can a *conjecture* find a place in the Œcumenical Creed of the Church? If you have to admit that one clause in the Creed is only a conjecture, what becomes of all the rest? Does it not reduce all the other clauses which the Creed contains—even those concerning the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of our Lord—to a similar conjectural level, open to discussion, and subject, perhaps to additions by local councils, perhaps to evisceration at the hands of university professors? I do not think that it is difficult to see how it is that the Easterns look upon the conduct of the Latins in introducing and insisting on maintaining the *Filioque* into the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed as the first step in that doctrinal disintegration in the West which has stage by stage arrived at the state of things which we now see in Protestant Germany. In the witty, but not the least exaggerated words of the Russian theologian Khomiakoff, the conception of the Church has there come to be that of 'a society of good men, differing in all their opinions, but earnestly seeking for truth, with a total certainty

that it has not yet been found, and with no hope at all ever to find it'!

Thus the Russian theologians of whom I am speaking see, in the introduction of the *Filioque* into the Creed in a local church, without the authority or even the knowledge of the whole Church whose Creed it was, the practical admission of the principle which afterwards took the shape of Protestantism. But how was it that a fully developed form of Protestantism did not immediately arise? This, they say, was due to the fact that the West was still living much too close to the traditions and life of the individual Church to arrive at such a result without an intervening interval. That interval was bridged over by the Papacy. By assigning to the canonical arrangements of the Œcumenical Councils, by which the order of precedence of the principal sees of Christendom were regulated, a doctrinal, instead of a merely canonical and disciplinary significance, the theory was gradually evolved and eventually insisted upon, that, in as much as the See of St. Peter was universally acknowledged to be the first See of Christendom, the custody of the faith of the whole Church was in some peculiar way committed to that See, and that therefore the Western Patriarchate had the right to alter and add to the Œcumenical Creed, and that the rest of Christendom was bound to conform to

whatever Rome ruled to be the teaching of the Church.

But however successfully this as an accomplished fact might for a time arrest the process of disintegration in the Western Church, the basis on which it rested were feet of clay. The occupant of the Apostolic See of the West claimed powers, differing in kind from, and over and above, those of any other member of the Episcopate ; but from whom were these powers conveyed to him, and by what process were they conveyed ? So far as the Bishops were concerned, the Saviour had said to His Apostles, ' Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you,' and inasmuch as ' without all contradiction the less is blessed of the better,' the sacramental gift of episcopal consecration must come from a **higher** authority. This the Eastern Church provides for in the three or more Bishops, or at least two, whom she requires for the consecration of a Bishop. They act not in their individual capacities, but as a council of Bishops acknowledged by the whole Church as so acting on her behalf, exactly in the same way as an Œcumenical Council acts in the matter of defining the doctrine of the Church. But in the case of the Bishop of Rome you have not only episcopal, but super-episcopal powers claimed. How and by whom were, and are, these special powers bestowed upon each Pope on ascending the throne of St. Peter ? There has never been any sort of sacramental

formula provided for the purpose.¹ There is nothing but his election : but whether he was elected by the people or the clergy of Rome, or whether as later on by the cardinals appointed by his predecessors, and therefore undeniably inferior to him—how could they be the channels of those vast spiritual powers which they neither individually or collectively possessed in themselves ? Are not the Papal claims really a case of ‘ the greater being blessed by the inferior ’ ? This reversal of the right order of things, the Russian theologians say, logically led to the series of revolts in the Western Church which culminated in the great catastrophe of the sixteenth century, and in all the subsequent disintegration which has followed. If one Patriarch had revolted against the authority of the whole Church, what more natural than that in process of time one Province, or, as in the case of England, one group of Provinces, should revolt against the arbitrary authority of that Patriarchate ? What more natural than that, carrying the process still further, the clergy should revolt against their Bishops as did Luther ; and next, that the laity should revolt against the clergy, and that from henceforth Protestant Churches should become mere departments of the State ruled by the sovereign, or else communities in which their pastors received their

¹ Russian theologians often say that Papal claims involve an Eighth Sacrament. See p. 58.

sacred mission, not from a higher spiritual authority but from the congregation to whom they were to minister ?

To return now once more to the definition of the Church as 'faith and love as a living organism.' I have shown how they look upon the schism between West and East as affecting the faith of the Church ; but they lay no less emphasis on its effect upon the charity or mutual love of the members of the Church for one another. Nobody who has any knowledge of the history of the 250 years, from the time of Charles the Great, when the quarrel which led to the Schism began, down to the time of Leo IX and the Patriarch Cerularius, when it was consummated, will for a moment maintain that the faults in this respect were at all confined to one side. But nobody, I think, can deny that the action of Charles the Great in insisting on the right to add to the Creed without any reference to the East, and this just at the time when the Easterns were submitting the decrees of the Seventh General Council to the West for their consideration, was indeed a very great breach of Christian charity, and that the Papacy itself later on became involved in the guilt. The Easterns are never weary of pointing out that from that time forward the Western Church itself was torn asunder with rationalistic controversies which have never ceased from that day to this, and which never arrive

*
at a final settlement. They naturally point first of all to the controversies over the Eucharist, the Sacrament, *par excellence*, of love both between Christ and His members, and between the members themselves. No controversy on this subject, which had its origin on Eastern soil, has ever arisen in the Orthodox Eastern Church. On the other hand, from the tenth century onwards such controversies have been rife in the West. Councils might condemn Berengarius, might from time to time decree definitions, but the controversy soon broke out again in some other form in this or that place, and continued down to the Reformation, since which time these contentions have become more and more crystallised and there does not seem to be the slightest prospect of the West ever again becoming united on the subject.

The same thing is true as to the teaching and practice of the two main divisions of Christendom in respect to the communion of prayer between the living and the departed, concerning which there has never been any difference of opinion in the East, but which in the West has been for the last 600 years a subject of endless dispute. At first sight it might appear that there is little difference between Rome and the East so far as the subject of prayers for the dead and invocation of Saints is concerned. Roman theologians in their controversial writings against Protestantism make the most of the fact

that the East has retained those practices which Protestants reject : they treat the question as if it was one upon which there was no difference between East and West, and ignore anything that Eastern writers may say to the contrary, attributing their objections, if they notice them at all, to a less highly developed stage in theological evolution. The fact, too, that many of the Greek and Russian theologians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and even some in the last century, have made use of arguments borrowed from Latin theological text-books against Protestant objections upon this subject has lent additional colour to this supposition.

But the Russian theologians of the last century, whose views I have been placing before you, put the matter in a different light. We have already seen that they define the Church as 'faith and love as an organism,' that is to say, the Body of which Christ is the Head, and of which all those who have been, are, or shall be brought into it are the members, fulfilling itself indeed in time, but nevertheless constituting not an imaginary or allegorical, but a true and substantial unity. In fact there exists an essential difference between the Eastern and Western conception of the nature of the unity of the Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic stakes his membership in the Communion of Saints upon the fact of his submission to an external authority,

the occupant of the Primatial See of Christendom ; whereas the Eastern feels himself to be spiritually united with the Church upon earth *because* he is united with the whole Body and its Divine Head. He emphatically denies that its Divine Founder cut His Church up into sections, and that when He ascended into heaven He constituted that section of it which He left upon earth into a separate organism,* over which (as Leo XIII once told us) He 'was obliged to designate a vicegerent' in order to preserve the essential unity of the Church. Consequently, whereas when the Latin speaks of the Holy Catholic Church he ordinarily means merely the Roman Church living on the earth at the present time, the Eastern keeps much more prominently before his mind the fact that the one Body consists, as St. Chrysostom (in 'Ep. ad Ephes.' iv. 4) puts it, of 'the faithful from all parts of the world, who are, have been, and shall be.'

Invocation of Saints and prayers for the dead, in fact, form merely a portion of the mutual intercessions of all the members of the one Body for one another. We have already seen that Russian theologians define the Church as 'faith and love as an organism.' Mutual intercessions are at once the expression and the condition of this love, and indeed constitute the life blood of the Body, coursing through its members and quickening its being. To quote from a letter written to me by a Russian

theologian :¹ ' The Church is grounded upon love, and is joined together by love in all her parts and members. Without love she is inconceivable

Joined together in one compact organism, the visible Church, which is a part of the whole Church of Christ, constitutes for the believer heaven upon earth. Established in a world of enmity, she, in as much as she is grounded upon a new principle of life, detaches her members from sinfulness, and brings them nearer to the Maker and Father of all men, and before all to Jesus Christ, the Fountain of love, the chief Corner-stone, and Head of the whole Church. With His infinite love He permeates and embraces the whole Church, as being His own Body, inseparable from Himself, and in its essence indivisible. It was for this union of all believers that He prayed to God the Father in His prayer on the night before He died: " Holy Father, keep in Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are. . . . I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one" (John xvii. II, 23). In uniting Himself to the Church by means of this new principle of life, this " new Commandment," a man finds in her nothing which is alien to himself. On the contrary, he there finds himself, but himself not in the weakness of his spiritual isolation, but

¹ The Archpriest E. Smirnoff, in a letter written in 1897. His quotations are from Khomiakoff.

in the strength of his spiritual union with his brethren and with his Saviour. He discovers in her himself in his perfection, or rather that which there is of what is perfect within him—that is to say, Love, which, in the defilements and impurities of each individual in his separate existence, is constantly tending to disappear. This purification is accomplished by the invisible power of the mutual love of Christians in Jesus Christ, in Whom love finds its realisation in its highest form. “How, it will be said, can the union of Christians give to each individual that which none of them has in his separate capacity? It is true indeed, that the grain of sand does not receive a new being from the vessel into which chance has thrown it. Such is a man in Protestantism. The brick, placed in a wall, is in no wise either changed or improved by the position assigned to it by the bricklayer’s square and level. Such is a man in Romanism. But each particle of matter, which has been appropriated into a living body, becomes an integral part of its organism, and itself receives a new significance and a new life. Such is a man in the Church, in the Body of Christ, the organic principle of which is Love.” Neither the Latin nor the Protestant will agree with such a definition of the Church as this; for the former is ever “thinking of a unity of the Church of such a nature as would leave no traces of a Christian man’s liberty,” while the latter “maintains

a freedom of a kind in which the unity of the Church disappears altogether. But we [Orthodox] proclaim the Church to be both one and free. This Church, which is one, without having any need of an official representative of its unity, and which is free without its liberty manifesting itself in the disunion of its members, is, if I may be allowed to use the language of St. Paul, a stumbling-block in the eyes of the Judaizing Latins, and foolishness in the eyes of the Hellenizing Protestants; but for us she is the manifestation of the wisdom and infinite mercy of God upon earth. It can be seen that there is an essential difference between the idea of the Church and that of the Western Communions. The Church considers herself to be an organic unity, the living principle of which is the Divine grace of mutual love. As for the Western Communions, their idea of unity is quite conventional, and consists with the Protestants in nothing more than the arithmetical total of a certain number of individuals whose tendencies and beliefs are tolerably nearly identical, and with the Romans in nothing more than in a harmony of movements in the subjects and vassals of a semi-spiritual monarchy." "

It follows, then, that the Russian theologians consider the differences which they find between the Latin teaching and their own on the subject of the invocation of Saints and of prayers for the

dead, to constitute, not a mere development of statement, but an actual alteration due to an altered conception as to the essential nature of the unity of the Church. That the communion of prayer between the visible and invisible world was not at once discontinued, as it afterwards was in nearly all the sects which arose out of the bosom of the Western Church, was, they say, due not to any essential necessity for retaining it, but to the habit and tradition of the Church, which was too notorious to be at once rejected. But it had to find a new *raison d'être*.¹ 'Founded on faith in the principle of love which unites the life on earth with the life in heaven, just as it unites individuals in their earthly life, when once this principle was lost sight of it had to find a new explanation. Communion of prayer manifested itself in two forms, requests for intercession addressed to the invisible world, and prayer for the invisible world addressed to God. Romanism took upon itself the position of an intermediary power between Paradise and Purgatory—that is to say between

¹ It is a remarkable fact that whereas almost every religious body which has arisen in Western Christendom since the separation of East and West has shown a tendency to discontinue or to reject altogether the invocation of Saints, the sects which have arisen on orthodox soil, including even those bodies of Old Believers who have rejected the hierarchy and therefore the Sacraments have all retained this practice, just as have the Nestorians, Armenians and other bodies who separated from the undivided Church of the General Councils.

two societies, of which one stood higher and the other lower than itself, asking good offices of the one and conferring them upon the other. . . . The Latinizer, whether in the prayers which he addresses to the Saints, or in those which he says for the dead, from the point of view of the Orthodox Church still continues in his isolation. A simple citizen of a society [housed in a building] of three stories, he is not a member of a living organism. He asks of those more powerful than himself their high protection, he accords his puny protection to those who are worse off than himself, but his poor individuality does not lose itself in a superior life of which he forms a part ' ¹

It can hardly be doubted that it is this different conception of what constitutes the Church's unity which accounts for the much more vivid realisation of the nearness of the spiritual world which strikes all who have come into close contract with Eastern religion as contrasted with what obtains in the West. The separation between the visible and invisible world seems to be non-existent. You may hear a son who has that day prayed for his mother's soul at her grave entreat her, together with the Holy Mother of God and the Saints, to pray for him before he goes to bed at night. I have seen in one of the cemeteries of the great monasteries which surround Moscow a newly engaged couple

¹ Khomiakoff, *The Latin Church and Protestantism*, p. 121-22.

having a service for the dead said at their parents' grave, and immediately afterwards have heard them asking them to pray to God for a blessing on their marriage, and I subsequently found that this custom is as common as possible. The language used in the poetical addresses to the Saints in the Eastern service-books may at first startle Westerns who are not accustomed to it, but when analysed is found only to be an expression of faith in the efficacy of the prayer of the righteous, and does not differ in kind from requests of the same sort to the living. If we find in the service-books 'All our hopes we place in thee, O Mother of God,' I have heard¹ the same sort of thing said to Father

¹ This occurred on many occasions when I had the privilege of being with Father John, whether in the two Russian capitals and their neighbourhood, or amongst the peasantry in the Government of Olonetz. I first made his acquaintance on the shores of Lake Onega, where I by chance met him, when he was returning from a visit to his o'd home, and I had the happiness of spending the whole of one of the most wonderful days of my life in his company, when, following the example of his Divine Master, he went about all day amongst the peasants in the neighbourhood, doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil.

After all, none of us would consider that the man who said to his doctor, called in to heal himself or anyone dear to him of a dangerous illness, 'I place all my hopes in you' was thereby infringing upon the supreme prerogatives of the Divine Majesty. If in the case of many Englishmen it would be more natural to use such words to a doctor than to a saint (living or departed), this only means that the ordinary Englishman has more faith in the skill of a physician than in the efficacy of the prayers of a righteous man, and that in fact his general outlook upon things is not so close to that of the son of Sirach (Eccles. xxxviii. 11, 12) as is that of the ordinary Orthodox

John of Cronstadt by individuals who were requesting him to intercede for them. To quote once more from Khomiakoff :—

‘ We know that when any one of us falls, he falls alone ; but no one is saved alone. He who is saved is saved in the Church, as a member of her, and in unity with all her other members. If anyone believes, he is in the communion of faith ; if he loves, he is in the communion of love ; if he prays, he is in the communion of prayer. Wherefore no one can rest his hope in his own prayers, and every one who prays asks the whole Church for intercession, not as if he had doubts of the intercession of Christ, the one Advocate, but in the assurances that the whole Church ever prays for all her members. All the angels pray for us, the apostles, martyrs, and patriarchs, and above them all the Mother of our Lord, and this holy unity is the true life of the Church. But if the Church, visible and invisible, prays without ceasing, why do we ask her for her prayers ? Do we not entreat mercy

Russian. With regard to the Saints, I have frequently found it difficult for Russians to understand the mentality of those English clergymen, who in endeavouring to reduce the spiritual world to ordinary material conditions of space and time, after having invited their congregations to sing hymns about having

‘ Mystic sweet communion

With those whose rest is won,’

mount the pulpit and declare that, whatever they may feel about the Saints, they must not on any account be on speaking terms with them.

of God, and Christ, although His mercy preventeth our prayer? The very reason that we ask the Church for her prayers is that we know that she gives the assistance of her intercession even to him that does not ask for it, and to him that asks she gives it in far greater measure than he asks : for in her is the fulness of the Spirit of God. Thus we glorify all whom God has glorified and is glorifying ; for how should we say that Christ is living within us, if we do not make ourselves like unto Christ ? Wherefore we glorify the Saints, the Angels, and the Prophets, and above all the most pure Mother of the Lord Jesus, not acknowledging Her either to have been conceived without sin, or to have been perfect (for Christ alone is without sin and perfect), but remembering that the pre-eminence, passing all understanding, which She has above all God's creatures was borne witness to by the Angel and by Elisabeth, and above all, by the Saviour Himself, when He appointed John, His great Apostle and seer of mysteries, to fulfil the duties of a son and to serve Her.

' Just as each of us requires prayers from all, so each person owes his prayers on behalf of all, the living and the dead, and even those who are as yet unborn : for in praying, as we do with all the Church, that the world may come to the knowledge of God, we pray not only for the present generation, but for those whom God will hereafter

call into life. We pray for the living that the grace of God may be upon them, and for the dead that they may become worthy of the vision of God's face. We know nothing of an intermediate state of souls, which have neither been received into the kingdom of God, nor condemned to torture, for of such a state we have received no teaching either from the Apostles or from Christ, we do not acknowledge Purgatory, that is, the purification of souls by sufferings from which they may be redeemed by their own works or those of others for the Church knows nothing of salvation by outward means, nor any sufferings whatever they may be, except those of Christ, nor of bargaining with God, as in the case of a man buying himself off by good works.

'All such heathenism as this remains with the inheritors of the wisdom of the heathen, with those who pride themselves of place, or name, or in territorial dominion, and who have instituted an eighth Sacrament¹ of dead faith. But we pray in the spirit of love, knowing that no one will be saved otherwise than by the prayer of all the Church, in which Christ lives, knowing and trusting that so long as the end of time has not come, all the members of the Church, both living and departed, are being perfected incessantly by mutual prayer. The Saints whom God has glorified are much higher than we, but higher than all is the'

¹ See p 45

Holy Church, which comprises within herself all the Saints, and prays for all, as may be seen in the divinely inspired Liturgy. In her prayer our prayer is also heard, however unworthy we may be to be called sons of the Church. If, while worshipping and glorifying the Saints, we pray that God may glorify them, we do not lay ourselves open to the charge of pride, for to us who have received permission to call God "Our Father" leave has also been granted to pray, "Hallowed be His Name, His Kingdom come, His will be done" And if we are permitted to pray of God that He will glorify His Name, and accomplish His Will, who will forbid us to pray Him to glorify His saints, and to give repose to His elect? ¹ For those indeed who are not of the elect we do

¹ Khomiakoff is here referring to the passage near the commencement of the Great Prayer of Intercession after the Consecration of the Eucharist in the Liturgy of St Chrysostom, in which the Eastern Church *prays for*, as well as asks to be assisted by the prayers of, all the Saints

'And further we offer to Thee this reasonable service on behalf of those who have departed in the faith, our ancestors, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Virgins, and every just spirit made perfect in the faith, especially the most holy undefiled, excellently laudable, glorious Lady, the Mother of God, and Ever-Virgin Mary, the Holy John the Prophet, Forerunner and Baptist, the holy, glorious and all-celebrated Apostles, Saint N (*the Saint of the day*), whose memory we also celebrate, and all Thy Saints, through whose prayers look down upon us, O God And remember all those that are departed in the hope of the resurrection to eternal life, and give them rest where the light of Thy countenance shines upon them.'

not pray, just as Christ prayed not, for the whole world, but for those whom the Lord had given unto Him (John xvii. 9). Let no man say: "What prayer shall I apportion for the living or the departed, when my prayers are insufficient even for myself?" For if he is not able to pray, of what use would it be to pray even for himself? But in truth the spirit of love prays in him. Likewise let him not say: "What is the good of my prayer for another, when he prays for himself, and Christ Himself intercedes for him?" When a man prays, it is the spirit of love which prays within him. Let him not say: "It is even now impossible to change the judgment of God," for his prayer itself is included in the ways of God, and God foresaw it. If he be a member of the Church his prayer is necessary for all her members. If the hand should say, that it did not require blood from the rest of the body, and that it would not give its own blood to it, the hand would wither. So a man is also necessary to the Church, as long as he is in her: and if he withdraws himself from communion with her, he perishes himself and will cease to be any longer a member of the Church. The Church prays for all, and we pray together for all; but our prayer must be true, and a true expression of love, and not a mere form of words. Not being able to love all men, we pray for those whom we love, and our prayer is not hypocritical;

but we pray God, that we may be able to love all, and pray for all without hypocrisy. Mutual prayer is the blood of the Church, and the glorification of God her breath. We pray in a spirit of love, not of interest, in the spirit of filial freedom, not of the law of the hireling demanding his pay. Every man who asks "What use is there in prayer?" acknowledges himself to be in bondage. True prayer is true love'

I have dealt with the question of the Communion of Saints at great length, partly because I was anxious to quote from Russian writers themselves, in order to show English churchmen that the writer of Tract XC was neither alone nor the first to maintain that there is a Catholic doctrine on the subject which is not to be confounded with 'the Romish Doctrine concerning Purgatory and invocation of Saints,' which is objected to in the Thirty-nine Articles, and partly because of its extreme importance in the eyes of Eastern theologians. In the words of the writer of the letter from which I have already quoted, 'nearly the whole range of Christian dogmatics centres itself upon this point and crosses and recrosses it: and this because there can be no doubt that it rests upon the doctrine of the Orthodox Church concerning the nature of the Church herself.' I had intended to touch upon several other doctrinal questions, but time will not permit, and I must

bring my observations to a conclusion. In laying the views of the Slavophile school of theologians before you, the question may naturally arise whether I have not been exaggerating their importance, and been dealing with the opinions of a school of thought in Russia rather than with the doctrine of the Russian Church. I do not think so. If the theological method of these writers was a new departure at the time when they made their appearance, this was only because the Russian theologians of the previous two centuries in their controversial writings had borrowed their weapons from Non-Orthodox sources, drawing largely, sometimes on Latin, sometimes on Protestant systems of theology in order to combat the arguments of the one or the other, as necessity arose. The Slavophile theological movement was in reality a return from a non-Orthodox to an Orthodox system of theology. While there was much that was new in its methods, it will be found to fit in completely both with the Orthodox standards of earlier centuries and with the Russian Catechism and other authoritative formularies which had been set forth in the 'thirties and 'forties of the last century. As we have seen, the keystone of their position, namely their teaching concerning the nature of the Church, received a striking confirmation from the reply in 1848 of the Greek Patriarchs to the Encyclical of Pius IX. The fact that this was signed by three Patriarchs

and a Synod of twenty-eight Bishops, and was subsequently translated and set forth in Russia by the Holy Synod, constituted it as near a document of Œcumenical significance for the Holy Eastern Church as was possible under the circumstances of those times. I have never come across a Russian theologian who was prepared to dispute the soundness of their general line. And while, as I hinted at the beginning, the lines which Eastern theologians follow in their controversial writings against Rome and Protestantism are not always such as render them readily serviceable to Anglican controversialists, still I am sure that the basis on which these writings rest, namely the authority of the undivided Catholic Church, is identical with that for which the Church of England stands. The object of our Association is not to make Anglicans of the Russians nor Easterns of the English, but to get to understand one another better, our teaching, our history, our modes of thought. Thus, if pursued on the charitable lines with which intercourse between Russian and English churchmen is at present so happily conducted, is the surest way of drawing our Churches nearer to one another, and to the consummation of that ultimate object we all have at heart—the restoration of Communion between our Church and the Orthodox East.¹

¹ In the course of a somewhat severe passage upon Anglicanism in his third Essay upon 'The Latin Church and Protes-

tantism,' written in 1857, soon after the secession to Rome of Mr. Palmer and others, when it naturally appeared to our Russian well-wishers as if the whole Catholic movement in the English Church was likely to come to an end, Khomiakoff writes : 'Anglicanism by its most distinguished representatives has condemned the Roman Schism in all its distinctive dogmas (that is to say in the Papal Supremacy and in the addition of *Filioque*, an addition which the scholars of Germany, and amongst others M. Bunsen, likewise declare to be an obvious falsification). Anglicanism has not a single reason to give, and has never given one, for not being Orthodox. It is in the Church by all its principles (I mean by that, its real and characteristic principles) ; it is outside the Church by its historic provincialism, a provincialism which imposes upon it a false appearance (*faux-air*) of Protestantism, which deprives it of any tradition, and of any logical basis, but from which it has not the will to emancipate itself, partly because of national pride, and partly because of the habitual respect of England for an accomplished fact. . . .'

The Russian Church

IV

Its Ceremonial

TO cross the threshold of a Russian church is to step out of our Western world into a scene which, in all its strangeness to our eyes, charms our curiosity and arouses the sense of mystery. The appearance of Oriental gorgeousness and the primitive design of the pictures and frescoes in the more ancient temples, the great Screen of Icons and the sense of spaciousness in the freedom from the obstruction of seats, combine to transport a visitor far from the familiar atmosphere of an English church. But to stand among the people in a cathedral or in the far-away crypt of a monastery chapel, in the dim light of the candles and the undulating reflection of the lamps as their rays flicker upon the innumerable Icons on the walls and on the precious metals and jewels of the shrines, to hear the wonderful harmony and plaintive melody of their Slav chants, to watch the rapt attention of the men standing in a brotherhood of every class together at their worship, to see the combination, unwonted to us, of homeliness with pomp, of mystery with simplicity, is to realise

a new emotion of the nearness of heavenly things and the meaning of adoration. Before us is the lofty sanctuary screen, resplendent with the tier over tier of the pictures of Christ and His Mother, of the Saints and Angels, who are felt truly to be present with their brethren of the earth. Then as the doors are thrown open and the purple-robed Bishop enters surrounded by his attendants, and after being clothed, in the midst, in his golden robes of pontifical dignity, proceeds into the Holy of Holies, and as the glories of the chant arise, no one but will join with the people in bending low in their spirit of brotherly humility before the throne of our common Lord.

It need hardly be said that the centre of their liturgical worship is the Eucharist, and it is in connection with this that the chief ceremonies are performed.

The Liturgy, above all else, retains the primitive aspect of being the great synaxis or common gathering of the faithful as the family of God in His House. In the West the restlessness of modern life, the needs of missionary work, the frequency of Communion, and the desire of each priest to celebrate daily, have combined to bring about the development of Low celebrations of the Mass without incense or chant, and the offering of it for the devotion of the priest or for a few alone. In the East, where time is of less object and has brought

fewer changes from primitive ways and ideals, there is usually the one Liturgy at which all are expected to be present, at which all the clergy of the parish or monastery will assist, vested at the Altar, and make their Communion. It is this rule that gives us frequently that most magnificent and at the same time most moving and brotherly of liturgical functions, the concelebration of the Mass by a Metropolitan and several Bishops, each attended by his own priest and lower ministers. These are all robed in their liturgical vestments, and if, as often may be seen, they are all of one suit of coloured brocade, the effect is superb and beautiful, as the sacred ministers stand in two lines of shimmering gold. During the singing of the Creed each will approach and give the Pax or Kiss of Peace to the Bishop, and then in turn to each of the others as they stand in prayer, grouped round about the Altar 'throne' in the midst.

At the time of Communion, after the chief Celebrant has received, he stands aside and the other Bishops approach in order, and administer the Holy Gifts each to his own Priests and Deacons.

Another striking and primitive characteristic of the Orthodox services, both of the Liturgy and of the rest, is the threefold participation by Celebrant, Deacon, and choir. To the Celebrant are assigned his own prayers, which he recites

chiefly in secret in the sanctuary behind the screen or Iconostasis, and he is only visible to the congregation at times when the door and curtain are thrown open.

Thus is preserved the ideal of the mysteriousness of the Holy Altar and the things of God, whilst at the same time the prayers and litanies are chanted by the Deacon standing outside the screen, in a language understood and followed by the people, the choir responding in the sonorous harmony for which Russia is so famed. At moments, the three come to a common point, and the Priest's voice is heard singing the doxology that sums up both his prayer and the people's intercessions.

Another point may here be considered—the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. This is perpetually reserved in every Church in a Tabernacle, on the High Altar as a rule, for the Communion of the sick and for the Mass of the Presanctified. But the idea of privately visiting the Holy Sacrament of our Blessed Lord's presence is hardly known amongst the Orthodox. This is not due to any lack of clearness of faith in the real change of the Bread into Body of Christ. To quote from the Greek Catechism: 'Every Christian must unhesitatingly believe that by this Sacrament he receives the true Body of Christ.' Or from the Synod of Bethlehem: 'The bread and wine after Consecration are changed, transubstantiated, con-

verted, transformed : the Bread into the true Body of our Lord, which was born in Bethlehem of the ever Virgin Mary . . . and shall come again at the end of the world.'

The devotion has not been developed as in the West, and there the Church has not yet brought out of her treasure this new thing for the spiritual comfort of her suppliants. We may account for this lack of development by remembering that the East has not suffered as we in the West by heresies about the Real Presence, which have stimulated the devotion by reaction. Also the outward form in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved, not being a beautiful white wafer, but intinct crumbs, and also the fact that It is kept behind the screen and the closed doors and curtain, have militated against the growth of the full realisation of all that the acknowledged fact of the Sacred Presence involves.

The Eastern Liturgy, too, is so rich in symbolism ; the elements of adoration, sacrifice, and intercession are so long drawn out and elaborated in the service itself, that the need of having these various elements expressed more fully in additional services is not felt in the same way as in the West. On the other hand, there may be noticed distinct signs during the last fifteen years of an increase of outward reverence of this kind. The congregation now pays more attention to certain points

in the Liturgy than of old, such as the Consecration, and the bringing out of the Sacrament for Communion, and again at the end when it is being taken to the Credence for the ablutions. Indeed a more striking act of worship could hardly be seen than at the Mass of the Presanctified which is celebrated throughout Lent, except on Sundays and festivals and Saturdays. When the Consecrated Gifts are brought in solemn procession to the Altar at the Offertory, the whole congregation of thousands will fall in prostration on the floor. Or again, I have seen in a Children's Mass in the Cathedral at Petrograd, when the Bishop brought forth the Holy Sacrament at the end to give therewith the accustomed Benediction by making with It the sign of the Cross over the people, all the 1200 children prostrated with their foreheads to the ground.

Throughout all the diversity of Orthodox ceremonial from our own, we can nevertheless trace easily the fundamental similarities, but the characteristic is that every act is, so to speak, on a greater scale. The primitive exuberance of Gaul and England in liturgical matters and in ceremonial was curbed steadily by the reserve of the Roman spirit. But in the East the emotional and dramatic spirit had full play. The sense for display and richness of symbolism inspired the ritual of Byzantium, and yet with all the pomp and variety of

ceremonial there is the native dignity and naturalness of movement which we know to be so unattainable in our own case. The greater scale of which I have spoken may be seen in the sign of the Cross, which with us has been restrained to a movement of inches, but with them is one of feet. The placing of the bread and wine on the Altar in the Roman and Prayer-book rites by the shortest way remains with them a procession with all adjuncts of impressiveness. No service takes place without incense, and that with censuring, frequent and repeated, of persons and things. Our lights, regulated by ceremonial rule or by fear where no fear is, become with them a profusion of candles and lamps before each object of devotion. Our pictures and images, if tolerated at all, are few in number and jealously denuded of honour, lest Chancellors should fall into idolatry: the Russian Church sets them everywhere, accessible even to her little children, that they may bring to their minds the nearness of the Saints, and receive their loving kiss and gifts of devotion. Our kneeling and genuflection is still with them an alternation of standing and prostration to the ground. All is intensely dramatic and cannot but arrest the wandering attention of the worshipper. But all this elaboration of ceremonial in religion, to be rightly appreciated, must be seen in its proper setting. It is the expression of a people's faith,

a people's life. Russia is to-day as scarcely another in the world, as regards the mass of her population, a believing country. The vast majority of her children, to the number of about one hundred millions, are members of the Orthodox, or, as we should say, the Catholic Church. They are attached to her and to her worship with a deep affection. They cling to her fundamental ideas of the meaning of life and of religion with intense fervour and simplicity of belief.

It is when you have a national consciousness like this, of the supernatural ; when the facts of the nearness of God and of the other world are part of the mental atmosphere into which men are born, that you have as a natural consequence the phenomena which are apparent to the most unseeing eye of a traveller, both the ubiquity of the outward symbols of the Faith—Churches, pictures, Icons, relics, and shrines—and also the spontaneity and the simplicity of the people's response to these appeals to their religious sense ; the natural manifestation of their consciousness of the other world.

I have indeed in fifteen years seen even in Moscow the Holy City, where Christ seems visibly to reign, some lessening of the outward show of devotion, that religion of the street, which contrasts so much with our English reticence. The ideas underlying the popular manifestation of unrest, known as the revolution, have turned

men's minds somewhat from the old paths and to independence of thought. But still in every street and village road; amidst the splendours of the Imperial palaces, or in the squalor of the peasant's hut on the far-off plains: in every room, and shop and hall: in every vessel and in the stations of the iron way: at the head of every valiant regiment and in the dark ships of war that guard her coasts to-day from the foe—there is the Icon, the perpetual appeal of the spirit world, the reminder of the care and love of God and of his chosen Saints, their brothers who have gone before. Ever before their eyes is Christ in blessing, opening the Gospel at the words, 'Come unto me all ye that are weary,' or the Blessed Mother of God, entitled of Humility, or of Compassion, or of such and such a home of her veneration. St. Nicholas, too, the patron of sailors and children, is greatly loved and has a big place in the heart of the nation. These Icons take a large part in the ceremonial worship of the Orthodox Churches, being repeatedly censed during public service and illumined with ornamental lamps and with candles bought at the church door and offered as votive gifts at any moment in the services when a suppliant may wish.

And this finds its counterpart in private devotion. Morning and evening the devout Churchman will stand, using the primitive attitude of prayer, before his Icon at home, and cross himself many

times, prostrate and kiss the Icon, as he makes his petition and gives his adoration.

And this great part that the outward and visible have in their worship, is not only *natural* to the Russian, but is specially *needed* by his nature. With his fortunate endowment of a share of the 'oriental' cast of mind, the Slav is not only virile and determined of will, but emotional, imaginative, and introspective. If one may draw a contrast between Eastern and Western Christianity, one may say that the religion of the former lies rather in prayer than in good works, in worship than in preaching, in fasting and penance than in evangelical zeal, in mysticism rather than in activity. If with us faith is an act of will; with the Russ it is a natal instinct. And so it is that he is peculiarly liable to error, and to wandering into strange paths of emotional religion. If he cast off the restraints of the historical and authoritative Church ~~and~~ adopt various protestant or self-made creeds, he is apt to go off into wild and immoral extravagances. Thus it is that the emphasis laid upon the objective in his worship by the outward images ever before his eyes is to him of the greatest value. They serve to remind that his feelings are not of the chief importance; but that there is, for all alike as a permanent object of faith and adoration, the living and present Person of the real Christ, portrayed in the historic incidents of His life. Thus

the use of all these objects of devotion and this ceremonialism, so far from being, as is sometimes supposed, a mark of a false emotionalism or æstheticism in religion, are a great safeguard against the abuse of the subjective emotions, and against the worship of the false gods created of our uncontrolled imagination.

This national attachment to the ritual and symbols of the Church has of course its roots in the history of the people. The Church has been both the inspirer of national unity, and the mainstay in times of trouble of the courage and independence of her children. The famous picture of the Redeemer which hangs over the Holy Gate of the Kremlin, to which every passer-by pays special reverence, is the banner which led the army to victory over the persecuting Poles in 1613, at the bidding of the Abbot of the ancient home of liberty, the fortress-monastery of Holy Trinity, Moscow. And it must be remembered that ecclesiastical art and symbol came with the dawn of civilisation to Russia in the hands of the missionaries from Constantinople. Just as in the Western Church so much of our ceremonial, our sacred vestments and art came from the Court of the Roman Emperor, so through the Greek Church, the Court of Byzantium gave to the Church of Russia her robes, her ceremonial, and her architecture. Escaping the long process of transformation under the 'Gothic' spirit and

practically untouched till lately by the Renaissance, the art in her churches is of a debased and Russianized Byzantine form, with considerable traces, as in the peculiarly shaped 'onion' domes, of Oriental influence. And so one sees in the glories of the great pontifical services in her cathedrals, the heirlooms of the Imperial and Christian City of New Rome. In her ceremonial pomp and magnificence, the shadow of the Court : in her art, the hardly recognisable descendant of the ancient Greek.

But though in this way the ceremonial of the Church is a most interesting survival, it is by no means only a survival as is so largely the case in the West. It is, as we have seen, most intimately bound up with the people's life of to-day, and the ritual actions in church are for the most part the common actions and gestures of daily converse. The gentleman who is accustomed after each meal, courtier-like, to kiss his hostess' hand, will not be shy of kissing the crucifix and the hand of the Priest in church. The salutation exchanged between men at Easter in the Temple is not strange to those who habitually kiss in the same way in society. The peasant boy who prostrated in thanksgiving to God in my room before the Icon was one who immediately afterwards prostrated at my feet because I had, under Divine Providence, obtained for him a benefit. The man who stands

before a chapel in the middle of the traffic and crosses himself, is one who every evening makes the sign of the Cross over his child and receives the same from him with clasped hands in the bidding of good-night. You will see the worshippers who stand for long hours at the Vespers of Palm Sunday holding their tapers in their branch of palm, afterwards bearing them twinkling through the snowy darkness to their homes as the Light to lighten every man's heart. It is indeed, with so natural and demonstrative a people, a difficult thing to say where ceremonial begins and where the natural expression of their life and feelings ends. It is rather that the latter are taken up and sanctified in the Rites of Holy Church. So a Pilgrim will march for a thousand miles bearing his shroud and his lantern, and, at the end, the trudge is transformed into a ritual procession and his burden finds its sanctification on the tomb of his Saviour. Is the last kiss of the dead before the altar a ceremony or a natural farewell? And at what point does the simple showing of joy at the 'homecoming' of a saint, in the translation of her body to a new shrine prepared by her 'sisters' in her old nunnery, blend into a Church Ceremony of Reception and Deposition?

It is indeed that all life is a sacrament; daily life is the material of religion, and religion consecrates this life.

There are those who cavil at Russian superstition. What is superstition? There are, as in England, relics of magic and witchcraft, and in greater quantity, for Russia is only now emerging from the Middle Ages. But this is not what is spoken of. What is meant so often is a belief or a religious act which to the critic of the moment is foreign to his understanding or uncongenial to his prejudices. Surely superstition must really involve wrong belief or false gods. But before the ordinary religious practices of the Orthodox Christian the word superstition dies on our lips. Is it superstition that a dying child should cling to his mother's hand? What comfort, what help, can there be in such mortal clay? And if the Russian (and let us remember not the peasant alone, but the most highly cultured persons) find spiritual comfort in the Icon, in the Priestly blessing, in the shrine; if he loves the signs that speak to him of the nearness of God, loving and merciful; if he honours the almost sacramental symbols of his own sense of the invisible, are we to dub it superstition when perhaps of a truth it is that we can neither rise to the height of his spiritual vision nor come down to the simplicity of his faith?

Surely it is the stiff formalism of the mind that sees in the forms naught but forms, and that would take out of the world the finger of God and out of religion all that is natural, that is the true super-

stition, ascribing, as it does, what speaks of the spiritual in the world of matter, to Beelzebub.

Russian religion is intensely sacramental because to him life itself is sacramental through and through.

It may be said that to the Russian the act of pilgrimage is a sacrament of life, for deep down in the heart of the Slav is an underlying consciousness that life here is a pilgrimage through this somewhat melancholy world ; in which hardship, pain, and injustice find their natural place, and ever the thought is present of his companions on the way, the world of saints, the Guardian Angels, and his beloved dead.

And so with the Seven Holy Mysteries or Sacraments with which God accompanies the soul from birth to death, thereby translating it out of a merely early existence into the Kingdom of His dear Son. These, too, take their place most naturally in the Russian's mind. And they in their turn are surrounded with a multitude of symbolical and quasi-sacramental rites. On the eighth day after birth, the Priest comes to give the child the Christian name, and to sign him with the Cross. He is then presented to the Lord and lifted up before the Icon of Mary, Mother of all. At his Baptism, the evil spirits who are so real to them are exorcised. He is anointed as a learner and then is thrice immersed in the water in the Holy Name of the Trinity.

The babe then straightway receives the Sacrament of Confirmation, by anointing with the Holy Chrism after the ancient mode of East and West, is invested with the little 'Chrisom' robe, and is given a 'tonsure' in token of his dedication as servant to God. On the fortieth day, he with his mother makes a beginning of attending church, and, if a boy, is brought into the sanctuary and laid before the Altar.

Being innocent, without bar of sin, he is then suffered as a little child to 'come to Jesus,' and makes his Communion regularly until old enough for his first Confession, about eight or ten. And it is natural to him, realising all the privileges given to him by God in His Church, to seek the pardon of the Church when in sin, through the Priest's words, after Sacramental Confession, 'I, an unworthy Priest by the power that is given unto me, forgive thee and loosen thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen.'

The Church consecrates the holy estate of Marriage and shows forth its dignity by the ceremony of the Coronation, in which two metal crowns are placed on or held over the heads of the bride and bridegroom.

Throughout life there are various occasions when rites of blessing are performed. Every Easter the house and its indwellers are blessed with Holy Water, the rivers and lakes all receive

benediction at Epiphany in memory of our Lord's sanctifying of water at His Baptism. From each Mass the faithful may take home the 'antidoron,' the holy bread to be eaten fasting, as a reminder of Holy Communion. On each vigil of a great festival the whole congregation goes up to the Priest to receive the anointing with blessed oil on the forehead, as type of the gift of the Spirit.

Is he sick? Then there are the Elders of the Church to come to him, and in lengthy rite to consecrate the oil according to the words of St. James and administer the Sacrament of Holy Unction on forehead, nostrils, cheeks, lips, breast, and hands, that 'the same Father who did send the Lord who healeth every infirmity, may heal the sick man from every weakness, bodily and spiritual, that it may be for a perfect deliverance from sin, and an oil of gladness and sanctification.' But beside the comfort of the Sacraments of Unction, Confession, and Communion, the devout will still, maybe, crave for the sight of an Icon he loved of old to visit. The venerable picture of Our Lady of Iberia has her carriage and horses, and will be brought to his bedside that he may plead for her motherly aid so oft bestowed.

We may sum up then the ceremonial and ritual of the Russian Church in saying that it is above all sacramental in the widest sense; and that this is what especially makes it so dear to them as

intimately fitting their inborn habit of thought. Their Churches have a quickly recognisable atmosphere of prayer, and their worship, while true to the popular and the 'people's own,' if churchgoing is to be any test, is yet never brought down to the people's level, but, throughout all the sacramental aids for men's souls and the litanies of petition for their needs, there always runs the dominant note of the Godward aspect of worship. 'In music, ceremonial, and long rhapsodies of praise, the heart is lifted up, that, in the words of the cherubic hymn at the Offertory procession, 'we may raise on high the King of all, on shield and spears, by Angelic hosts invisibly upborne.'

It has been pointed out by Palmer that the apparent divergence in dogmatic statement between East and West is frequently reconciled—counterbalanced—in the complementary mystical symbolism of some parallel ceremonies in the respective Churches.

Thus while the Eastern teaches that the 'Holy Spirit proceeds from God the Father,' the Western creed has, 'from the Father and (or through) the Son.' Now, in the Sacrament of the Holy Ghost, Confirmation, the method of the Unction may be seen to symbolise in either Church, not her own dogmatic expression, but on the contrary that of the other Church. Each is complementary to the other. So the Unction of the Spirit is given

the Orthodox Church from the Bishop through the Priest, whereas in the West it is administered by Bishop immediately. Certainly this symbolic had no part in the development of the at least as far as man's intention went; *theless* it will serve to remind us that it is a Universal Church alone that the fullness of harmony of Truth and of spiritual Life can be. The eye cannot say to the hand 'I have need of thee.' No part of the Church can be ignorant to itself, but the more isolated, the more *ruined*. The Church is made one body in Christ each part endowed with spiritual gifts which given to be shared and ministered to the rest. *be* more unlike Eastern Church manners of worship, habits of thought, and expressions of the Catholic faith may be to our own, the more need *we* have of mutual intercourse that we may learn lessons the Holy Spirit has to teach us through that are not ours but are none the less equally. Each Communion has Truth and spiritual experience complementary to the other, each shall *we* and gain, until we be all come unto the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ.

